DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 681 FL 013 544

AUTHOR Kramsch, Claire J.
TITLE Interaction in the Classroom: Negotiated Roles and Meanings.
PUB DATE Nov 82
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (New York, NY, November 25-27, 1982).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; Classroom Techniques; Communicative Competence (Languages); Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; Secondary Education; *Second Language Instruction; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Conversation

ABSTRACT

Research on communicative processes in classroom second language use is reviewed, and exercises for developing interactive skills and culturally appropriate conversational behavior are suggested. The inability of students to actively participate in the second language classroom is related less to deficient knowledge of form than to inability to manage the social and cultural context of classroom discourse. Traditional teacher and student roles give teachers complete control over communication, thus neglecting language used for natural communication. Exercises designed to encourage natural conversation in the high school or college classroom are described. The 19 exercises are built around three levels of increasing complexity: teacher and language oriented, partner centered, and topic/situation bound. They include such tasks as answering and addressing the teacher, constructing a topic through associations, addressing a fellow student, interrupting the lesson, capturing attention, showing understanding, asking for clarification, conducting an interview, and role playing conversations. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227681

Claire J. Kramsch

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Foreign Languages and Literatures
Department of Humanities
Room 14N-226
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, Mass. 02139

Interaction in the Classroom: Negotiated Roles and Meanings

The inability of students to interact naturally and actively in the foreign language classroom has often less to do with their lack of knowledge about the language than with their inability to manage the personal, social and cultural context of classroom discourse. This paper will summarize recent research on communicative processes in language use and suggest exercises for activating and developing interactive skills in the classroom and for learning culturally appropriate conversational behavior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Claire J. Kramsch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL 013 544

Interaction in the Classroom: Negotiated Roles and Meanings[1]

The inability of students to participate actively and communicate naturally in the classroom has often less to do with their deficient knowledge of the structural and lexical forms of the language than with their inability to manage the personal, social and cultural context of classroom discourse. Traditional teacher and student roles give the teacher overwhelming privileges in the management of communication (Kramsch, 1981). It is usually the teacher who manages topics, turns at talk and conversational tasks, who expresses and clarifies meanings, who suggests and rejects interpretations. Students are often woefully unaware that using a language for natural communication means more than just manipulating its structures. It requires a willingness and an ability to interact naturally, i.e., to express, interpret and negotiate meanings within the total context of the communication (Breen and Candlin, 1980).

This paper will summarize recent thought on communicative processes in language use and suggest exercises for activating and developing interactive skills between speakers and hearers in the foreign language classroom.

Communicative Processes in Language Use

The particular feature of language learning in classrooms is that the foreign language is both the content of instruction and the vehicle used for communication. Grammatical rules and vocabulary, cultural and literary information are learned in

a communicative context. This context is not only that of the fabricated or authentic texts found in textbooks and readers. It is also the classroom itself, where communication takes place in the foreign language.

In order to communicate with one another in the language, teacher and students need not only grammatical competence, i.e., a knowledge of sentences, but also what has been called "communicative competence" (Hymes, 1972; Savignon, 1972), i.e., a knowledge of how sentences are used in the performance of communicative acts of different kinds. As Hymes expressed it: "There are rules of use without which rules of grammar would be useless"(Hymes, 1972:14). These rules of use are the rules of personal, social and cultural appropriateness both within and outside the context of the classroom.

Ever since Hymes' seminal essay on the "ethnography of communication" (Hymes, 1964) and Labov's paper on the social context of language (Labov, 1970), applied linguists have been concerned with elucidating the rules and conventions of language use in natural communication. They draw in particular from research done in socio- and psycholinguistics to analyze the way speakers and writers "use sentences in combination for communicative purposes",i.e., to construct discourse (Widdowson, 1978). Research in applied linguistics focuses on the social rules of turn-taking (Sacks,Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974), on strategies and tactics in spoken discourse (Faerch and Kasper, 1980; Tarone, 1980) and on such psychological factors as the presuppositions and expectations of speakers/hearers and writers/readers (Breen and

Candlin , 1980; Rubin, 1981). They emphasize the nature of language as a collaborative social process, rather than as a product of grammatical and lexical conventions. Speakers/hearers achieve discourse coherence by constantly estimating each other's prior knowledge and assumptions,by making and testing hypotheses (Faerch and Kasper, 1980), by making inferences (Carton, 1971) and by selecting language that will be interpreted in accordance with the meaning they intend to convey (Littlewood, 1981:3). Through these and other communication strategies, they "reduce the uncertainty" about each other's presuppositions and expectations and achieve understanding at all levels of communication (Berger, 1979).

Participants create, i.e., express and interpret meaning on three levels: the ideas or concepts they communicate about (ideational level); their own interpersonal behavior (interpersonal level); the formal rules of the language itself (textual level) (Halliday, 1973; Breen and Candlin, 1980:90). On these three levels, meanings are not fixed by dictionary definitions, nor by the sole intentions of the speaker/writer. Communication is not a one-sided process or a simple transferral of information (Riley, 1980). In order for communication to take place, individual participants have to share potential meanings, i.e., negotiate intended and perceived meanings (Breen and Candlin, 1980:92). "Language",says Brumfit (1980:1) "is not a set of definable and prearranged tokens but a process of linguistic and cultural negotiation of meaning."

The concept of negotiation of meaning is central to the view of language as a communicative, i.e., interactive, process.

> Wenn wir Sprache als wichtigen Teil sozialer Interaktion betrachten und ihren Bedeutungswert aus dieser ableiten, dann sind wir genötigt, Sprache als Prozess zum Gegenstand des Unterrichts zu machen. Wir müssen dann die Lernenden in der Anwendung der produktiven und interpretativen Strategien schulen, die erforderlich sind, wenn sie sich in einer Wirklichkeit verständigen sollen, in der das, was die Gesprächspartner meinen, keineswegs feststeht und unmissverständlich ist, sondern erst zwischen ihnen "ausgehandelt" werden muss (Candlin, 1978:24).

This applies both to face-to-face interaction and to the understanding of written texts. Since there can be no interpretation without interaction (Widdowson, 1979:152), foreign language learners can be trained to see in a text more than "a collection of formal objects held together by cohesive devices", such as conjunctions or pronouns. As discourse between a writer and a reader, a written text uses sentences to perform acts of communication and elicit interaction with its readers. Students can be made aware of the "necessarily interactive character of the interpretative process of reading" (Widdowson, 1979:98; Kramsch, 1982a).

Because of its interpersonal nature, the communication process is permeated by social and cultural attitudes, values and emotions. Communication is a socialization process that involves the whole personal and social development of the learner (Breen and Candlin, 1980: 91). Communication in the foreign language is, in addition, a process

of acculturation in which students learn forms of conversational behavior which are for the most part foreign to them. This paper will explore ways in which the socialization and acculturation of the learners can be furthered through an interactional approach to classroom teaching.

One could argue that there has always been a great deal of communication going on in the most traditional language classrooms. It is true that traditional language teaching can elicit lively interaction, but this interaction is rarely the type encountered in natural situations. Because it focuses primarily on language as an object of instruction, rather than as a vehicle for natural communication, traditional language teaching tends to create a climate where instructional relationships, rather than meanings, are expressed, interpreted and negotiated. The foreign language is often used and perceived by the participants as a means to express, challenge or confirm the linguistic and administrative authority of the instructor. Transcriptions of classroom discourse (Butzkamm, 1982; Edmondson, 1982; Leemann, 1982; Nold, 1982) show the inordinate amount of time and energy spent in traditional foreign language classes negotiating intended instructional tasks and power distribution.

A methodology that focuses on the communicative use of language searches instead to activate the students' interactive ability to negotiate meanings and discursive roles (Gremmo, 1977) for natural communication purposes. It offers new roles for classroom members: "The role of learner as negotiator - between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning - emerges from and intersects with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedures and activities which

the group undertakes" (Breen and Candlin, 1980:100).

The following exercises will illustrate ways in which natural interaction can be encouraged even within the pedagogical context of the classroom. They have all been used successfully at various levels of instruction and to accompany various textbooks and readers. Some of them have been used effectively with high school students, for whom they were originally designed. Others were designed specifically for college students at M.I.T.

Speakers/Hearers in Interaction

Partners engaged in natural conversation have to negotiate discursive roles and tasks. Depending on the participants, the format of the activity, the choice of topic, the topographical arrangement of the group, the time and mood of the day, partners in an interaction may choose one of several roles. At any given time, they may decide to be silent observers, or to take the initiative, they may help others formulate their thoughts, summarize/organize what others have said or elaborate on others' ideas, they may give feedback or comments (Schein, 1969; Kramsch, 1982b). In addition, they have to clarify and manage the topic of the conversation. Knowing how to construct a topic, how to steer it, how to expand or avoid it, are some of the major tasks in natural communication (Keenan, 1976).

Interactional roles and tasks are not fixed once and for all by traditional teacher/student statuses, nor are they predetermined by students' personality traits. Interactive behavior in the classroom can change if students are made aware of the strategies needed for communication, and if they are given both the opportunity and

the linguistic means to activate those strategies.

Natural interaction can be systematically integrated into any teaching methodology from the beginning to the advanced levels. An interactional syllabus can be built around three levels of increasing complexity, in which the interaction is respectively: 1) teacher/language-oriented, 2) partner-centered, 3) topic/situation-bound.

1. Teacher/language-oriented interaction

At this beginning level, the students practice taking turns, giving feedback and comments with the teacher as their major conversational partner.

1.1 Taking the initiative

Exercise 1. Answering the teacher (with hand signal)[2]. In order to have "something to show" for their participation in the classroom, students receive a 3x5 index card on which they write their name and class. Each day the students write the date on their cards on the appropriate line. Every time a student volunteers to answer a question or to do board work, that student places a check next to the date. The student must initiate the conversation response to receive credit. Each check is worth 1/8 point. At the end of the marking period, the students total the checks and divide by 8. The total is added to the base score (average of tests, quizzes, projects, homework) before the average is taken.

Joe Smith	Period 1
9/1	✓✓
9/2	✓
9/3	✓✓✓
9/4	✓✓✓✓✓

Exercise 2. Addressing the teacher (with hand signal). Same exercise as above, but the students' contributions are free, i.e., they have not been elicited by a question or a request from the teacher. One-word contributions are acceptable. Grammatical incorrectness is not penalized; the teacher merely echoes the utterance in its correct form or with the correct pronunciation, as in natural conversation.

1.2 Giving listener's feedback (without hand signal)

Exercise 3. The teacher uses in the course of the lesson some of the most frequent listener's feedback gambits and writes them on the board. These are, for example: was ?, wirklich ?, ja ja, ja ?,stimmt das ?, toll ! The teacher shows how to echo a speaker's utterance to show sympathy and understanding, either with one of these gambits, or with partial or total repetition (auf der Straße ? heute morgen ?).S/he then chooses a fictitious unexpected news item, such as "Heute keine Schule !" The class is challenged to react to the news in at least four different ways. Students in pairs then repeat the exercise with a news item of their choice. After these preliminary exercises, the students are encouraged to use listener's feedback strategies during the normal course of the lesson, in reaction to the teacher's instructions and explanations, e.g., "Seite 35 ? stimmt das ? Ubung 4 ?

ja ? ". For each listener's signal given spontaneously and appropriately, the student receives one credit on his/her participation card.

Students might be reluctant to adopt here a behavior that would not be theirs in their mother tongue. This reluctance can be overcome by presenting these interactional exercises as games, where typically German conversational roles are played.

In addition to learning how to take the initiative, the students are also taught how to manage topics. The goal at this early stage is to activate the imagination of the students, by encouraging them to create meaning, free of any social or cultural constraints. They are shown how the language can create its own interactive realm, where meanings arise from free associations and fantasy combinations.

1.3 Constructing a topic[3]

Exercise 4. The teacher brainstorms with the whole class free associations, triggered by each other's contributions. A topic is given, e.g., Grün. Going around the room, the teacher encourages students to build on associations related to that topic, with words, expressions or sentence elements. Example: "Was kannst du zu dem Thema grün sagen ? - Bäume - John sagt Bäume, was sagst du ? - Gras". These first two associations suggest the topic Natur. A third association, "Studenten auf dem Gras", seems to steer the topic to Studentenleben. The association suggested by the next student, "Weihnachten", shows a definite switch to the topic Schulferien. It finds the approbation of the next three students, who decide to add to it such subtopics as "Ferien", "Schlaf" and "keine Schule". The teacher makes the students aware that each in his/her way has managed and constructed

the topic Grün suggested originally.

This exercise can be conducted in small groups of 7 or 8 students with a time limit of 2 minutes. The last topic generated by each group is then shared with the whole class,compared with that of the other groups and justified.

Exercise 5. Same exercise as above but the teacher writes the students' associations on the board. The students are then asked to group them into thematic categories or topics. These topics may refer to things, persons or activities (Natur, Schule), or to grammatical concepts (Verben, Adjektive). The class is asked to expand one of the topics, e.g., Natur, by brainstorming topical associations, using the vocabulary they have learned: "Was kannst du zu diesem Thema sagen ?" - "Ich gehe gerne spazieren / schönes Wetter heute, nicht ? / die Sonne ist warm / Rucksack."

Exercise 6. The teacher or a student suggests a topic taken from the textbook or the reader, e.g., one of the topics found in Moeller/Liedloff, Deutsch Heute: Künstliche Farben, Vorurteile, Lebensstandard, Naturprodukte. The topic is written on the board, the class is divided into two groups. The group which can brainstorm the most sentences pertaining to that topic within the time limit (4 minutes) wins. The sentences may consist of a main clause (one point) or of a main clause and a dependent clause (two points). No one-word contributions are accepted in this exercise. Grammatical incorrectness is not penalized, as long as the sentence is understandable.

1.4 Expanding a topic.

Exercise 7 . Students learn how to explore all aspects of

a given topic. Selected students are given 4 x 6 cards, each containing a topic formed of familiar sentence elements, e.g., "letzt/Wochenende/machen/Ausflug". The teacher asks one student: "Was hast du letztes Wochenende gemacht ?" A possible answer may be : "Letztes Wochenende haben wir einen kleinen Ausflug gemacht". The other students have to expand this topic with questions addressed to the first student, e.g., "mit wem warst du ? wo seid ihr hingegangen ? was habt ihr gemacht ?" This exercise resembles similar exercises to practice interrogative clauses, but it is done here for communicative purposes, namely, the collaborative construction and expansion of topics.[4]

Exercise 8. Students sorely lack imagination to use the vocabulary they have already learned. A talk-a-thon can be played on a topic familiar to the students, such as "Mein Lebensstandard in 20 Jahren". In answer to the teacher's challenge :"Wer kann am längsten über dieses Thema reden ?", one student starts talking, using all the vocabulary s/he can think of (possibly with open book), paraphrasing him/herself if necessary. The goal is to keep talking. If the student stops for more than five seconds, s/he has to give the floor to the next student. The winner is the one who has talked the longest. The point is not speak with perfect grammatical accuracy, but to generate as many sentences as one can.

2. Partner-centered Interaction

At the intermediate level, students learn not only to create meaning, but to negotiate this meaning with other conversational partners. They achieve this through a more elaborate turn-taking routine, and through simple topic steering strategies.

2.1 Taking the initiative

Exercise 10. Addressing a fellow student (without hand signal). This exercise is similar to exercise 2, except that here the students must address each other, not the teacher, by spontaneously taking the floor. For example, after a fellow student's response to the teacher, a student might ask for clarification or make a comment, e.g., "wie meinst du das ?", or "ich habe nicht gehört, was du gesagt hast, wie war das ?", or "das stimmt !", "da hast du recht". These phrases have been written on the board by the teacher at the beginning of the lesson, so that they are available to the students at any time. The participants' cards now include two columns: teacher and fellow student, and the check marks are entered into the appropriate column.

Exercise 11. Interrupting the course of the lesson (without hand signal). At the beginning of the period, each student is given a card with instructions how to take the floor during the lesson. Once the students have used their conversational opener, they turn the card upside down on the desk in front of them. No one whould leave the room without having taken the floor at least once. Simple instructions might include: "Du sollst den Lehrer höflich unterbrechen: Herr/Frau X, ich wollte was fragen:" - "Du sollst einem Mitschüler zeigen, dass du ihn verstanden hast: du hast recht / das finde ich auch !" - "Bitte den Lehrer oder einen Mitschüler um Erklärung : Moment, wie meinst du das ?" - "Bitte einen Mitschüler um Wiederholung: Entschudigung, ich habe nicht gehört, wie war das noch einmal ?" With more proficient students, the instructions can be somewhat more complex, for instance: "Unterbrich den Lehrer mit einer persönlichen Meinung:

ich finde:" - "Frag einen Mitschüler, ob du ihn richtig verstanden hast: du meinst . . ." - "Greif auf eine frühere Aussage zurück: ich möchte kurz auf das zurück, was . . ."

2.2 Capturing attention

Exercise 12. To capture the teacher's attention, the following phrases are listed on the board and are practised with the right intonation: "Also, ich möchte was sagen " - "Darf ich kurz etwas fragen" - "ich hätte mal eine Frage" - "Dazu möchte ich was sagen"- "Darf ich mal kurz unterbrechen". Students are to use these interrupting gambits, together with a hand signal, in the course of the lesson.

Exercise 13. To practice German patterns of interruption, students in pairs have to defend two opposing viewpoints, e.g., "Unsere Schule ist die beste" vs. "Unsere Schule ist miserabel", with a time limit of 3 minutes. As soon as one partner has made a statement which the other finds inacceptable, the other has to interrupt and make his/her point. They have to use the appropriate German interrupters, listed on the board: "Moment mal" -"Ja, also, hör mal " - "Stop" - "Also pass auf" .

2.3 Listener's signals

Exercise 14. Showing or checking understanding. Students in pairs. One is given an A card, the other a B or a C card. Neither of them knows what is on the other's card. A: "Sie erzählen Ihrem Partner (Ihrer Partnerin) etwas Aussergewöhnliches, was Sie unlängst erlebt haben. Sie beginnen mit: "Stell' dir vor, neulich ist mir folgendes passiert." B: "Während Ihr(e) Partner(in) spricht, sollen Sie ihm (ihr) zeigen, dass Sie ihn (sie) verstanden haben. Dafür wiederholen Sie ab und zu mit anderen Worten, was

er (sie) gesagt hat (z.B ach was ! gestern ? im Kino ?)"
C: "Während Ihr(e) Partner(in) spricht, sollen Sie ihm (ihr) zeigen, dass Sie ihn (sie) verstehen wollen. Dafür bitten Sie drei- oder viermal um Erklärung (z.B. wie meinst du das ? was meinst du ? du meinst . . . ?)". Time limit: 3 minutes.

Exercise 15. Asking for clarification. Students in pairs, sitting back to back, or exercise done as homework, over the telephone. Student A is given a card: "Sie sind ein Marsmensch. Da es neuerdings Telefonverbindungen zwischen der Erde und Mars gibt, und da alle Erdbewohner Deutsch sprechen (was sonst ?), rufen Sie einen Erdbewohner an und interviewen ihn für Ihre Marszeitung. Da die Verbindung sehr schlecht ist, müssen Sie öfter um Wiederholung bitten und für alles, was Sie sagen, eine Paraphrase oder eine Erklärung geben." Student B is given the corresponding card: "Da es neuerdings eine Telefonverbindung zwischen der Erde und dem Planeten Mars gibt, rufen Sie Mars an und interviewen einen Marsmenschen für Ihre Lokalzeitung. Alle Marsmenschen sprechen fliessend Deutsch (was sonst ?) . Da die Verbindung sehr schlecht ist, müssen Sie öfter um Wiederholung bitten und für alles, was Sie sagen, eine Paraphrase oder eine Erklärung geben."

2.4 Steering/avoiding the topic

Exercise 16. Students in groups of 4 or 5 role-play a crazy cocktail-party where everyone talks only about his/her favorite topic (children, sports, sex, books, or one of the topics covered in class). As one student starts talking, the others must find points of possible topic switch to interrupt him/her as soon as possible and steer the conversation onto their own topic. In the

end, the group is to guess each participant's "obsession". Time limit: 10 minutes.[5]

3. Topic/Situation bound Interaction

On the more complex level of interaction, students are taught to interact within the social and cultural constraints encountered in natural settings.

3.1 The speaker/hearer team

Exercise 17. Hedging and avoidance strategies. Students in pairs role play a telephone conversation between husband and wife. Card A: "Sie sind mit Ihrem Mann seit 8 Jahren verheiratet und haben sich immer ein Kind gewünscht. Ihr Mann ist mehr für die "Ungebundenheit". Ihr Arzt sagte Ihnen soeben: Sie sind schwanger. Sie haben Ihrem Mann versprochen, ihn gleich zu benachrichtigen; rufen Sie ihn im Büro an ! Sie brauchen Redewendungen, die zum Thema überleiten können, etwa: naja / tja also / was ich noch sagen wollte . . ./ach weisst du . . ./die Sache ist die: " - Card B: "Sie sind mit Ihrer Frau seit 8 Jahren verheiratet. Heute morgen musste Ihre Frau zum Arzt. Sie fürchten, Sie könnte krank sein. Sie hat versprochen, Sie gleich anzurufen. Um von ihr zu wissen, was mit ihr los ist, brauchen Sie solche Redewendungen wie: Was gibt's ?/Also ?/na und ?/was willst du eigentlich sagen ?/ komm doch zur Sache ! ".[6]

Exercise 18. The helpful interview. Students in pairs role-play a newspaper interview. Student A is given the following instructions: "Sie sind ein kluger Reporter. Sie wissen, dass direkte Fragen Menschen oft in die Defensive drängen. Sie interviewen einen Ihrer Mitstudenten (Mitstudentinnen) über seinen (ihren) Lebensweg und seine (ihre) Zukunftspläne für einen Artikel

im SPIEGEL. Sie sollen das ganze Interview mit nur 4 direkten Fragen führen. Sie dürfen keine weitere direkte Frage stellen, ehe Sie durch Paraphrase ("also . . .") den Interviewten (die Interviewte) zu weiteren Erklärungen und Kommentaren ermuntert haben. Zum Beispiel: "B: ich wohne immer noch zu Hause - A: Sie haben also keine Lust, wegzugehen - B: Lust schon, aber das Geld habe ich nicht -A: das ist also eine Geldfrage . . ." Student B is given the following card: "Sie werden von einem SPIEGEL-Reporter über Ihren Lebensweg und Ihre Zukunftspläne interviewt. Hier ist Ihre Chance, alles zu sagen."

Variant. Employer and applicant for a job. Employer: "Sie dürfen nur 4 direkte Fragen stellen, etwa: Warum wollen Sie Ihre jetzige Stelle verlassen ? Warum wollen Sie bei uns arbeiten ? Wie stellen Sie sich Ihr Leben in zehn Jahren vor ? Sie sollen den Rest des Interviews durch Paraphrase mit "also" oder durch Kommentare steuern, die den Bewerber zu weiteren Erklärungen ermuntern." Applicant: "Sie antworten mit Verzögerungstaktiken, die Ihnen Zeit zum Denken geben, etwa: ja also . . ., na ja . . ., wissen Sie . . ., eigentlich . . .". Time limit: 5 minutes.

3.2 Personal styles of interaction

Exercise 19. In groups of 3 or 4, students role-play various styles of participation in conversation with specific settings. They are given their role profiles on index cards. Examples: An der Bushaltestelle: A. jüngere Baronin, sehr gesprächig, höflich; B. 70-jähriger Mann, schwerhörig; C.Betrunkener, will immer grob unterbrechen.

Bei einer Party: A. deprimierter junger Mann, der seine Stelle

gerade verloren hat; B. Psychoanalytiker, der immer nur das wiederholt, was die anderen sagen; C. ältere Dame, die immer weiss, was man tun soll; gibt gute Ratschläge.
Am Familientisch: A. Sohn, schlecht gelaunt, sucht Streit;
B. Tochter, erzählt, was sie am Morgen in der Schule gemacht hat;
C. Vater, lenkt das Gespräch immer wieder auf seine Arbeit;
D. Mutter, stellt Fragen an jeden, und gibt Kommentare.

3.3. Opening and closing conversations

There are culturally specific rituals for opening and closing conversations. Students at advanced levels can learn the German rituals in three steps.

Step 1: Observation

A. hello

B. Tag

A. hast du dein Referat schon ?

B. nee, da sitz ich noch dran

A. also dann

B. ja

A. wir sehen uns morgen

B. ja, bis morgen

A. tschüss

B. tschüss

Step 2: Analysis. As the example above illustrates, closing sequences in particular include three steps (Jäger, 1976): signals showing readiness to close, followed by confirmation (also dann - ja), evaluation of the whole interaction (wir sehen uns morgen - ja, bis morgen), and closing signals (tschüss - tschüss Here are a few other possibilities within this framework:

1. Opening rituals: du (Klaus) / sag' mal / Tag / grüss dich / hello / du, pass auf / hör mal / entschuldige bitte.

2. Closing rituals:

Readiness to close: gut / also (dann), and confirmation: also / ja .

Evaluation of the whole interaction:

- Internal reason for closing: ich glaub das wär's dann, nicht ? - eigentlich ja / dann ist alles in Ordnung - ja .
- Summing up results: wir sind uns (also) einig / wir sehen uns also morgen (bald) / wir sprechen uns noch / ich mach' das schon / es war furchtbar nett.
- External reason for closing: es ist schon spät / ich muss noch was tun.
- Appreciation, thanks: schönen (vielen) Dank - nichts zu danken (keine Ursache/bitte bitte/gern geschehen) / ich freue mich schon darauf - ich auch / ich habe mich gefreut - ich auch / es hat mich gefreut - mich auch (ganz meinerseits).
- Agreement: bis Donnerstag elf Uhr ! / bis bald !
- Wishes: schöne Ferien (schöne Reise/schönes Wochenende/schönen Tag noch/schönen Abend noch/viel Spass !) - danke (ebenfalls/auch Ihnen) / mach's gut - du auch / alles Gute - dir auch / viel Glück (viel Erfolg beim Studium) - ebenfalls (gleichfalls) / gute Besserung ! - danke !
- Ratschläge : arbeite nicht zu viel - keine Sorge ! / Grüsse an . . . - richte ich aus (werd' ich ausrichten) / bitte vergib mir noch - is schon gut / sei mir bitte nicht böse - is in Ordnung (schon gut).

Closing signals: ja, dann / also / dann . . . auf Wiedersehen /

tschüss / salut / auf Wiederhören - auf Wiedersehen / tschüss / salut / auf Wiederhören.

Step 3: Practice. Students in pairs are to improvise short dialogues and give each interaction an appropriate ending. Examples: "Sie brauchen Hilfe beim Schreiben eines deutschen Aufsatzes. Ihr Freund ist sehr gut in Deutsch, ist aber sehr beschäftigt. Sie gehen trotzdem zu ihm . . ." - "Sie sind unzufrieden mit Ihrem Zimmer. Ihr Freund macht plötzlich einen Vorschlag. Jürgen sei nächstes Semester fertig und er habe eine phantastische Bude. . . " - "Sie haben gerade eine Stelle bekommen. Arbeitgeber: "Gut, Sie haben die Stelle". Sie: . . . "

Conclusion

Unlike instructional discourse, natural discourse is constructed through processes of expression, interpretation and negotiation of meaning. These processes are essential for understanding one another in the total personal, social and cultural context of the communication.

The activities suggested in this paper represent a modest attempt to introduce natural discourse in the classroom. They are not intended to supplement already overloaded syllabi. They indicate rather a new approach to teaching existing material, which furthers natural interaction among the participants and encourages the adoption of culturally appropriate behavior when using the foreign language.

This three-step interactional approach is based on the belief that students cannot be taught natural communication in the foreign language if they are not given the tools to

manage discourse and the opportunity to use these tools in the classroom. By taking an active part in the management of classroom discourse, students learn also to manage their own learning in a responsible and autonomous manner.

Notes

[1]This is a revised version of a paper given at the AATG Annual Convention in New York, November 1982.

[2]From Eugene Gramarossa, Classical High School, Springfield, Mass."Let 'em speak", paper presented at the Massachusetts Foreign Language Association Annual Convention, October 1982.

[3]Adapted from Rainer Sell," Early Emphasis on Speaking: An Associative Approach to Foreign Language Learning",Foreign Language Annals 10, 1977.

[4]See note 2.

[5]From Marlene Nusbaum and Liliane Verdier, Parlez sans Peur. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983, p.223.

[6]From Gernot Häublein, Theo Scherling and Gudrun Häusler, Telefonieren. Schriftliche Mitteilungen. München: Langenscheidt, 1982.

References

Berger, Charles R."Beyond Initial Interaction: Uncertainty, Understanding and the Development of Interpersonal Relationships." In Language and Social Psychology. Eds. H.Giles and R.N.St.Clair. Oxford: Blackwell, 1979.

Breen, Michael and C.N.Candlin . "The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching." Applied Linguistics, I:2 (1980).

Brumfit, Christopher J."From Defining to Designing: Communicative Specifications vs. Communicative Methodology in Foreign Language Teaching." In Studies in Second Language Acquisition. Ed. Kurt Müller, Vol.3, No.1. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Publications,1980.

Butzkamm, Wolfgang, "Analyse unterrichtlicher Kommunikation und das Problem der Methode", New Yorker Werkstattgespräche 1982, New York: Goethe House.

Candlin, Christopher N. "Form, Funktion und Strategie zur Planung kommunikativer Fremdsprachencurricula." In Kommunikativer Englischunterricht. Prinzipien und Übungstypologie. Ed. Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft Englisch an Gesamtschulen, Deutsche Bearbeitung Peter Mohr. München: Langenscheidt-Longman, 1978.

Edmondson, Willis. "Kann der Lehrer Fehler erzeugen ? - Überlegungen zum Korrekturverhalten im Fremdsprachenunterricht," New Yorker Werkstattgespräche 1982, New York: Goethe House.

Faerch, Claus and G. Kasper. "Processes and Strategies in Foreign Language Learning and Communication," Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, Utrecht, 1980.

Gremmo, M.J. et al. "Interactional Structure: The Role of Role," Mélanges Pédagogiques, Université de Nancy II: Centre de Recherches et d'Applications Pédagogiques en Langues, 1977. ERIC ED 149 626.

Halliday, M.A.K. Explorations in the Functions of Language. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.

Gumperz,J.J. and D. Hymes (eds) Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Hymes, D. "Introduction: Towards Ethnographies of Communication," in The Ethnography of Communication, Special publication of The American Anthropologist. Eds. J.J. Gumperz and D.Hymes, 66 (6) Part 2. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological ssociation, 1964.

Hymes, D. "On Communicative Competence," in Gumperz and Hymes, 1972.

Jäger, Karl-Heinz. "Zur Beendigung von Dialogen." In Heutiges Deutsch I/12, Projekt Dialogstrukturen. Ein Arbeitsbericht. Eds. F.J. Berens, K-H. Jäger, G.Schank, and J.Schwitalla. München: Max Hueber, 1976.

Keenan, Elinor Ochs and Bambi B. Schieffelin. "Topics as a Discourse Notion: A Study of Topic in the Conversation of Children and Adults," in Subject and Topic, ed. Charles N. Li. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Kramsch, Claire J. Discourse Analysis and Second Language Teaching. Language in Education Series, Vol.37 . Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1981.

_____ "Stratégies de communication, stratégies d' interprétation: l"enseignement de textes littéraires dans la classe de langue ," Proceedings of the TESOL-France First Annual Convention. Paris: ENST, 46 rue Barrault, Paris 13e, 1982a.

_____ "Through the Looking-Glass: Sensitizing the Learner to Discourse Dynamics," in New Yorker Werkstattgespräche 1982, New York: Goethe House, 1982b.

Labov, W. "The Study of Language in its Social Context," in Studium Generale 23, 1970, 30-87.

Leemann, Elizabeth. "Linguistic Input Data in the Foreign Language Classroom: Teacher Interaction Strategies and Student Participation in Target Language Discourse," in New Yorker Werkstattgespräche 1982, New York: Goethe House.

Littlewood, William. Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Nold, Guenter. "Grundzüge eines lernfördernden Sprachverhaltens des Lehrers im Fremdsprachenunterricht," New Yorker Werkstattgespräche 1982, New York: Goethe House.

Riley, Philip. "When Communication Breaks Down: Levels of Coherence in Discourse," Applied Linguistics, I, No.3 (1980) pp.201-216.

Rubin, Joan. "Study of Cognitive Processes in Second Language Learning," Applied Linguistics, II, No.2 (1981), pp.117-131.

Sacks, Harvey, E.A. Schegloff, and G. Jefferson. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation," Language,50, No.4 (1974),pp.696-735.

Savignon, Sandra. Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching. Philadephia: Center for Curriculum Development, 1972.

Schein, Edgar. Process Consultation: Its Role in Organizational Development. Chapters 3 and 4. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Tarone, Elaine. "Communication Strategies, Foreigner Talk and Repair in Interlanguage," Language Learning, 30, No.2 (1980).

Thomas, Laurie. "A Personal Construct Approach to Learning in Education, Training and Therapy." In Personal Construct Psychology. Ed. Fay Fransella. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Widdowson, Henry G. Teaching Language as Communication. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

_____ Explorations in Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.